UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

Two Great Pacifist Books

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

The Economic Foundations of the Church

By GEORGE WILLIS COOKE

Straight Thinking on the Question of War

By ROLAND D. SAWYER

All This Time

A Poem by ZONA GALE

VOLUME LXXXVIII NUMBER 5

Chicago, October 13, 1921

PUBLISHED WEEKLY.

UNITY

$3.00 PER ANNUM.

ESTABLISHED 1878

With THE FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, THE CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS, and all other organizations and individuals seeking to widen fellowship and to realize the Brotherhood of the Spirit unrimmed by creed, form or sectarian prejudices

EDITORS
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
FRANCIS NEILSON

ASSISTANT EDITOR
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCES L. ROBERTS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
Frank C. Doan
Charles F. Dole
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
George Grover Mills
Susan M. Quackenbush
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
Albert R. Vail
Arthur L. Weatherly
James H. West

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICAGO, ILL.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

Sample Copies of UNITY Sent Upon Request

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Contents:

EDITORIAL—

Notes.—J. H. H. 67
Two Great Pacifist Books.—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES. 69

THE PULPIT—

The Economic Foundations of the Church.—REV. GEORGE WILLIS COOKE 71

CONTRIBUTED—

Straight Thinking On the Question of War.—ROLAND D. SAWYER 76

SELECTED—

Concerning Some Beliefs On the Origin of the War.—G. DEMARTIAL 77

POETRY—

All This Time.—ZONA GALE 67
The Eternal Riddle.—*P. M. Raskin* 80

THE FIELD—

A Declaration Made at Peace Conference in Holland. 79
The Community Church 79
Disarmament and the U. S. Senate. 79

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOL. LXXXVIII. THURSDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1921 NUMBER 5

ALL THIS TIME.

All this time God has been coming so much nearer.
We thought that we heard him in thunder, in tempest, in fire.
We regarded disease as his visitation.
We looked on affliction as his chastening.
We said that poverty was his ruling.
In line and precept we searched out his will.
Then at last we listened. There within us
Was a touch, an impulse, an answer.
It was he! We had traversed miles and æons,
And here he was, all this time.

The still, small voice . . . why, the story means what it says.

ZONA GALE.

President Harding has done an appropriate and noble thing in naming Armistice Day (November 11th), when the Conference on the Limitation of Armaments is to begin its sessions in Washington, as an occasion of solemn holiday and public prayer. We have no great confidence in prayer as interpreted in the old-fashioned sense of special answer to divine petition; there is no heavenly deity who is going to intervene upon men's madness and stupidity and teach them to ground arms! On the other hand, however, we have every confidence in prayer as an expression of human need and aspiration, as a quest for strength to do and dare, as a consecration of the will to high endeavor. On this appointed day, let all places alike of business and of pleasure, be closed! Let the churches be opened, that the people may gather therein and speak the longing of their hearts for peace! Let great meetings of all the citizens be held in every great city and every remotest hamlet of the country, for the utterance of popular conviction and hope on this great issue! Let flags be flung to the breeze, let bells be rung, let bonfires be lit, that the governors of this land may know that the people are at last awake, and determined not again to be defeated or betrayed! The English Reform Bill of 1832 was put through because Parliament knew that its rejection would be the signal for revolution. The same fact made evident by popular demonstration on the eve of the Disarmament Conference, would make this Conference a success!

Mention of Armistice Day, the third since the suspension of hostilities in 1918, reminds us that Debs is still in prison! We don't know why we should speak of this, save to confess that we cannot get it out of our thoughts. Then, too, there is a query suggested by this circumstance! Is a country which can keep such a man jailed through all this period, the kind of country which can grapple triumphantly with such an issue as that of disarmament? This issue is fundamentally a moral issue—and so is Debs's imprisonment! Failure to meet the latter is sure prophecy of failure to meet the former. We suggest that, in full consecration of November 11th next, President Harding grant freedom to Eugene Debs, and therewith prepare America's soul for the task ahead.

In the most elaborate study ever made of the most tangled and difficult municipal railroad problem in the country, the New York Transit Commission comes out flat-footedly for public ownership and control. What is more, since the Commission is clothed with absolute powers, this report means that public ownership and control of street railroads has not only been recommended but will speedily be put into effect! It is certain that this revolutionary action on the part of the New York body marks the definite turning-point in the history of railroad operation at least in the cities and towns of America. The era of private ownership goes, and the era of public ownership comes! And who can object? Certainly not UNITY! We have always contended that municipal government is a simple matter of house-keeping, that is all, and that all utility operations of every kind should be in the hands of the people. Water, gas, electricity and transportation should be just as much community enterprises as street-cleaning, fire-protection and policing. To have a private company making profit from a person riding a hundred blocks in an electric car, is as intolerable a thing as it would be to have a private company making profit from a person walking ten blocks on a sidewalk. Most cities now own and control the water supply; but most cities still allow a few citizens, organized in private corporations, to tax the entire population, in terms of profit on investment, for electric light and telephone service. All this has got to go! Hence the satisfaction with which we read of the tremendous forward step taken in New York City.

We wonder if the time has not come to voice a protest against the Negro stories which are gracing, or rather disgracing, the pages of the *Saturday Evening Post* these days. We would not be squeamish or finnicky about anything; especially would we not exaggerate the importance of matters essentially trivial. But these stories, appearing in a magazine which boasts a weekly circulation of over two million copies, appear to

us to call for serious attention. Like all the stories and articles in the *Post,* the Negro stories are of a single type. They are standardized, like a Ford automobile. Given the situation as stated in the opening paragraphs, and it must be an exceptionally stupid reader who cannot forecast everything that is going to happen. The fundamental premise of these tales is that Negroes are in the infantile stage of racial development, and therefore, as grown men and women, ridiculous in their behavior. They are represented as childish, and therefore easily amused; gullible, and therefore easily deceived; superstitious, and therefore easily frightened. Somebody is always playing on their ignorance and innocence, and thus making fools of them. The costumes of the characters, their homes, their churches, their social life, are invariably described in the spirit of the cartoonist in the Sunday supplement. The language spoken is one unceasing flood of extravagant mispronunciations, bad grammar, and crazy malapropisms such as never came from the lips of any Negro anywhere. As stories, these machine-like depictions of "Darktown" life, have not a semblance of either art or reality; they are nothing but a kind of sublimated presentation of the black-face slap-stick sketch in the old-fashioned vaudeville show. Their one merit is a certain good nature and easy tolerance—these Negroes are laughed at; but would never be lynched. Even so, however, they are pernicious stuff. The Negro has a right to demand that he be taken seriously. He is entitled, like any other human being, to self-respect and dignity. To be symbolized as a joke may be in its way as painful, and in the long run as grievously unjust, as to be burned to death as a beast. It is time that these stories came to an end. Even the *Saturday Evening Post* should be ashamed of such drivel.

Dmitri Mereschkovski, the distinguished Russian poet, critic and historian, has written an article in which he discusses the problem of the relation between Bolshevism and the teachings of Count Tolstoy. In the course of his discussion, he makes one of the profoundest and truest remarks about non-resistance which we have ever seen. "Non-resistance to evil by force," he says, "may be doubtful from the point of view of ethics, but it is *indisputable in religion.* Ethics is progress from greater violence to less violence, while *religion repudiates all use of force.*" It is obvious that "ethics" is here used in the pragmatic sense. "Ethics" is a matter of adjustment or adaptation to reality—i. e., progress toward a goal. Religion, on the other hand, has arrived—it is the statement of the uncompromised ideal. Just here is the difference between ethics and religion, and the difference also between the moralist and the religionist. The religious or spiritually-minded man has already set himself to the task of the perfect life, which is the life of God. Thus necessarily is he a non-resistant. This is the talisman which enables us to tell at once whether or not a man has truly found the secret of religion. "Politics, ethics, æsthetics, and metaphysics," says Mereschkovski, "are not the yard-sticks by which you can measure Tolstoy. He is incommensurable by such standards. His measure is religion. The question of war, says Tolstoy, can only be decided by religion. He has withdrawn from us, because we have withdrawn from religion; and until we return to it, he will not rejoin us." Non-resistance is best described, perhaps, as *the program of religion.* It is what the man who believes in love, must *do* to make good his faith.

Should a church accept money on conditions? This question was raised sometime ago for discussion by a wealthy man's gift of $1,650,000 to the Home Mission Society of the Baptist Church, with the proviso that the organization must not accept the money unless it accepted also a certain statement of faith, prescribed by the donor, which included among other things the dogmas of Christ's bodily resurrection and of his visible return to the world. Dr. Shailer Mathews, the distinguished professor in the Divinity School of Chicago University, answered the question raised with an emphatic negative.

"If the Home Mission Society," he said, "can accept from one man a trust of more than $1,000,000, subject to the approval of the theological beliefs of the donor, can it decline gifts from other men and churches on similar conditions?" What, he asked, would become of religious liberty in Baptist churches, if such things were done? "What we really face," he said, "is an organized and heavily financed propaganda against the teachings of modern science, the application of Christianity to social reconstruction, together with the attempt to control by the power of money the convictions and the message of Christian evangelists and preachers."

This is well said—and politely said, too! Had he been using the language of the street, Professor Mathews would have characterized the proffered gift as *bribery.* And yet, in the face of such argument and fact, the gift of the millionaire was accepted! To such low estate as this have our Protestant churches fallen!

If the Baptist churches were willing to sell themselves for money, the Interchurch World Movement was not. At least its Commission of Inquiry on the great steel strike of 1919, was not! New evidence of this fact comes at this late day in the publication of the detached reports supplementary to the general Report issued in 1920. If anything could add to the distinction of this original document, it is these impressive supplements. Take the one covering the facts of espionage! Here is the whole sordid and ugly story of the work of the "under-cover" men employed by the Steel Trust to enter the unions and betray the men. These spies, maintained at an enormous expense as a definite phase of anti-union policy, worked like workingmen, talked like working-

men, whispered depressing rumors, stirred up racial strife, and "even in daily mailed reports advised 'influence' by municipal authorities to close up public meeting-places." The instances of espionage cited and described, says the foreword, are not exceptional; they are by no means confined to the steel industry. On the contrary, "the present report is a typical spadeful out of the sub-soil of 'business enterprise.'" It is further pointed out that "industrial espionage is confined to America; what espionage there is in Europe is a government monopoly, no other civilized country tolerates large-scaled, privately-owned, labor spying." These supplementary reports teach us all over again that this Commission of Inquiry accomplished the most remarkable piece of social work ever achieved in the religious history of America. It stands as a model instance of what can and should be done in these fateful days by the Christian churches.

We cannot read of the death of Humperdinck without a pang of sorrow. This distinguished musician was not the greatest composer of our time, but in the realm of opera he stood among the first. "Hansel und Gretel" is an immortal work, not only because of its own essential loveliness as music, but also because it opened the wonders of the opera-house to children. Has there ever anywhere been a more wonderful scene than the Metropolitan packed with boys and girls on a Saturday afternoon, to listen to the singing of this piece? "Konigskinder" is in many ways a greater opera; its folk-lore material is used to more majestic ends, but its scenes lack something of the utter simplicity of "Hansel." Its climactic moments, however, are unforgettable. We have seldom been so thrilled as in the second act when the gates of the city swing open before the crowd to admit the goose-girl; and for sheer pathos we know of nothing to compare with the fiddler's scene in the last act as the little children die in the snow. The first production of this opera in 1910 in New York, in the presence of the composer, marks one of the great moments in the musical history of America. Humperdinck's last years were clouded by the war—we suppose he wrote nothing during this period. He had probably done his best work, however; it is doubtful if he could have excelled these two operas which had made his name famous throughout the world. Both should be restored to the repertoire of the Metropolitan this winter.

Two Great Pacifist Books

No feature of the Great War is to our mind more remarkable than the enormous pacifist literature which it has produced. Of what other war in history can it be said that it inspired in its own time its own condemnation and repudiation? Pacifist writings began to make their appearance at the very opening of the struggle, as witness the works of such men as Bertrand Russell in England, Romain Rolland in France, Friedrich Wilhelm Foerster in Germany, and Oswald Garrison Villard in America. In spite of the vast machinery of repression which was early put to work in every belligerent country, the literature of pacifism continued to grow as the war went on. Most amazingly, as it seemed at the moment, this literature sprang most easily and blossomed most profusely in the soil of the trenches, where men were fighting and dying for the flag. Henri Barbusse, the French novelist, and Siegfried Sassoon, the English poet, are representative types of the pacifists who were bred on the field of battle. Now that the war is done, and men are free to turn from the world of action to the world of thought, this pacifist literature is pouring from the printing presses in a veritable flood. As though on the crest of a mighty wave, come two books which seem to mark the high-tide of anti-war utterance. We refer to Romain Rolland's "Clerambault" and Norman Angell's "The Fruits of Victory."

These two volumes are as different as the men who have written them. They may nevertheless be named together in this place not only because they have been published in this country at practically the same time, but primarily because they are books which we knew were destined to appear as soon as the war was finished. Those who knew Rolland and Angell knew that in the souls of both were gestating amid the darkness of world conflict, the messages of truth which now at last are given to the light. Not that either of these men was silent when it was perilous and by that very token most necessary to speak! On the contrary, Romain Rolland's voice was lifted at the first clash of arms, and was heard in passionate appeal for the higher things of the mind and heart, so long as riven Europe writhed in suicidal agony. His utterances during this period, gathered first in "Above the Battle" and secondly in *"Precurseurs"* (a volume of essays and letters as yet untranslated into English) stand as the immortal witness of a soul which refused to compromise with fear and hate. So also with Norman Angell! His calm, lucid, analytical mind moved with precision as exact during the fury of war as in the quiet days of peace. No writings showed more accurate comprehension of the forces at work in the world, or revealed more relentlessly the fallacies and deceits of current statesmanship than his two volumes, "Political Conditions of Allied Success," and "The Dangers of Half-Preparedness" (1917). Then, when militarism in England and America, bound the backs of its citizenry with the yoke of repression, Angell almost alone among liberals forgot not his old traditions, and in his "Why Freedom Matters" published the most important treatise on liberty that the world has seen since Mill. These men therefore served not merely

by standing and waiting for the better day, but by bearing witness with lips that refused to be silenced or soiled at the behest of Mars. But fullness of utterance was impossible at such a time. Men would not listen, even though the prophets spoke. Furthermore, the war had to run to its futile and horrid end before the measure of its betrayal of humanity could be made manifest. Therefore did we know that these writings during the war itself, sublime as they were, and immortal in the case of Rolland, were but as improvisations, in anticipation of and preparation for that great outburst of the soul which must come when the time was ripe.

Of "Clerambault" we shall not speak at length in this place, as we shall publish shortly a special article devoted to this work. Suffice it here to point out, in fairness, that Romain Rolland does not offer this novel as a study of the war. What concerns him at the moment is that loss of individual liberty, that "abdication of individual judgment before general opinion," which was characteristic not merely of the war, but of that whole trend of social development in our time, of which the war was but a culmination. The tyranny of government is matched by the subserviency of souls—the acquiescence of peoples in the fell business of repression.

"A few men," says Rolland, "incapable of understanding the complexities of the people, force thoughts and acts upon them in harmony with their own passions and interests by means of the falsehoods of the press and the implacable machinery of a centralized government."

And the people do not resist such betrayal of liberty!

"Man has slowly dragged himself out of the warm slime" only to let "himself slip backward into the collective mind, and the choking breath of the pit already rises about him."

If the race is to be saved, cries Rolland,

you must rouse yoursleves and dare to separate yourselves from the herd in which you are dragged along. Every man worthy of the name should learn to stand alone, and do his own thinking, even in conflict with the whole world. Sincere thought, even if it does run counter to that of others, is still a service to mankind; for humanity demands that those who love her should oppose, or if necessary rebel against her.

It is for this that Rolland writes his "Clerambault."

"This book," he says, "is not written about the war. . . . My theme is that the individual soul has been swallowed up and submerged in the soul of the multitude, and in my opinion such an event is of far greater importance to the future of the race than the passing supremacy of one nation."

Nevertheless, the war is in this book! Rolland admits that "the shadow of the war lies over it." On the title-page he describes his novel as "the story of an independent spirit *during the war.*" What we have, therefore, in "Clerambault," as the condition of the problem of the "independent spirit," is the psychology of war; and in no book that we have seen, is that psychology portrayed with such ruthlessness and also with such compassion as in this work. Here is the whole story of what the Great War did to the minds of men, and what it will always do so long as nation takes up the sword against nation. All types of men are revealed, every kind of mind depicted, in the growing lunacy of passion. And over against the raging mob of editors, priests, professors, politicians and the rabble, stands the heroic soul of the idealist who fights so bravely because he sees so clearly! It is a marvelous picture—the pacifist position radiantly outlined against the black background of hate and lust. Inevitably as one reads the story of his hero, one thinks of Rolland himself. The author insists that the book "is in no sense an autobiography." But if Rolland's career is not in these pages, his soul is; and in this soul we behold at once the depths of the world's infamy, and the heights to which the soul which is faithful and unafraid may climb.

Norman Angell's "The Fruits of Victory" derives its great significance from the fact that it is offered as "a sequel to 'The Great Illusion.'" In a recent review in *The New Republic* (August 24th), Mr. Francis Hackett well points out that "few men have ever lived to see themselves so borne out by facts as Norman Angell." In "The Great Illusion," which created so great a sensation when it was published some years before the war, the author argued *not,* as so many careless readers have supposed, that war was impossible, but that it was futile. In laying down this thesis, Angell was no fine-spun theorist, or even high-flown idealist. He was not even a pacifist in the accepted sense of that much abused word. He was simply a realist, who had a firm grip on the economic facts of international relationships, and who had come to see, out of a vision borne of knowledge, that war today is suicide. There was a time, as late even as the period of Napoleon, when a nation could prosper greatly out of a victorious fight against its neighbor. There was a time when warfare paid. But that time, said Angell, has now vanished away forever. War must be as disastrous today to the victor as to the vanquished. It is "the great illusion" to believe that anything is to be gained in this age out of fighting. War, he said, is "useless—useless even when victorious, as a means of securing those moral and material ends which represent the needs of modern European peoples."

All this was an argument when Angell set it down in "The Great Illusion." Now that the Great War has been fought to the bitter end, the argument has become a demonstration. The case is proved! It is this which constitutes the burden of "The Fruits of Victory." The Allies won the victory—there can be no question about that! They might have stopped the conflict at any time after 1915, and had the "peace without victory" for which Woodrow Wilson plead so nobly in January, 1917. But not so! They were determined to get something out of this war—to beat Germany to her knees, and wring from her helplessness compensation and advantages for their huge ex-

penditures of men and money. Hence the dictated Versailles Peace! But now that the tale is told, what have these relentless conquerors achieved? It is the answer to this question which Norman Angell presents in detail in the terrible pages of his book. There are no victors in this strugle, in the old sense of the word. All the nations have been defeated, the Allies as well as Germany—the Allies perhaps even more than Germany! The war was nothing in essence but one "vast orgy of physical self-destruction." The material losses, so incalculable and irreplaceable for all concerned, are of course obvious. What Angell's book makes particularly plain are the moral losses. The logic of his presentation of the "moral violence and chaos," which are "the fruits of victory," is as tremendous as that of Calvin in his "Institutes." If the victory was to be won, then the Allies had to obtain and maintain a preponderance of military power. This meant that the Allies must become a more terrible and effective Prussia than Prussia itself, and thus "betray the cause for which we entered the war." This betrayal, accomplished by secret treaties abroad and lying propaganda at home, resulted in a "nationalism which is intense, irresponsible and immoral." Such nationalism constitutes the suicide of Europe morally as well as economically, and thus in time the collapse and extinction of our civilization. "The fruits of victory," in other words, like "the wages of sin," are death.

Angell's remedy for all this is as valuable as his diagnosis, and it is stated as vigorously as a surgeon states the necessity of a major operation. Nationalism, he points out, means pugnacity; pugnacity breaks down interdependence among nations; such breakdown means an unworkable society, and hence ultimate destruction. This means, very simply and very plainly, that we must get rid of nationalism. "European society is today threatened with disintegration as the result of ideas and motions that have collected round Patriotism." Therefore we must have a complete revision of our popular nationalistic conceptions. We must get rid of "false pretences, sham heroics, immeasurable hypocrisy." Then organize for co-operation and goodwill!

It is fortunate that these two books, "Clerambault" and "The Fruits of Victory," have been published together, for they may well be read together. The one states the case of the idealist, the other of the realist. Both see the way of escape in freedom, which means the opportunity "to be intelligent." We must be "sincere and ardent in the cause of truth," says Rolland. "There is no refuge but in truth," says Angell.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

The greatest friend of Truth is Time.—*Colton.*

Next to love sympathy is the divinest passion of the human heart.—*Burke.*

THE PULPIT

The Economic Foundations of the Church

Sermon by George Willis Cooke, preached in Steinert Hall, Boston, January 23, 1921, before the Boston Community Church

The church is the institutional form of religion. What the form or the name it takes depends on the nature of the religion and the stage of culture it expresses. Religion varies its form with the developing life of mankind. The peoples who live by hunting develop one type of religion. Their gods are in animal form and their rituals are such as to facilitate their success as huntsmen. When animals have been domesticated the ritual changes and the gods approach a more human form. When the stage of agriculture has been reached, great nature powers are deified. The sky or sun becomes a father and the earth a mother; but in distinctly anthropomorphic form—that is, humanized. These successive stages of religious evolution are not invariably followed, but the above statements are suggestive of the processes by which religion advances from its lowest to its higher forms of expression as it is manifested in belief and ritual.

If we approach the higher forms of religion we shall find the same process of development at work in harmony with the evolution of social and political institutions. In all the early ages religion is intimately connected with every other phase of man's life and experience. It is not something apart, for a particular day, place, or form of expression. Art in the early ages has been said to be bound up with every other thought and activity; and this is not the less true of morality, as well as religion. Man sees his gods in every manifestation of nature and life. Religion is for him one with life itself, and no function of it can be apart from what religion means to him. If he hunts, herds his flocks, or puts seeds into the earth with expectation of a harvest, he is acting religiously, and every process has a ritual purpose.

It has been assumed by some interpreters of religion that its successive phases follow the developments of industrial and economic progress. This is true, but not the whole truth. Religion finds expression by means of the whole of human life, and is not limited to any especial phase of it. The statement that the manifestations of religion follow the successive stages of social and political progress is here meant to cover every phase of human development: It includes industrial and economic influences, but also much else that has the effect of shaping the successive stages in the evolution of religion. Morality, law, art, science also have their influence, and often of a most important nature. Back of all these shaping forces is the mind of man, psychology. When we consider the effects on religion of mythology, tradition, poetry, philosophy, metaphysical interpretation, we may realize the breadth of those influences which have created all of the religions of the world.

Let it be said at once that every god of all the religions has been created in the image of man. This evolution of God in man-like form has been described as animism, and in its more advanced stages as anthropomorphism. Truly, also, has it been said that an honest God is the noblest work of man. Not the less true is it that every religion in its origin has done little more than to reflect the life of the people with whom it originated. These ideas have now become

fundamental in the interpretation of religion, heretical as they were regarded at first.

I.

When the great nations came into existence in the evolutionary process, and with them the great religions of the ancient world, religion continued its intimate relations with the social and political advances of the several peoples. When great empires appeared, with their autocratic rulers, who had in their hands the power of life and death over their subjects, the rituals of religion took the form of bloody sacrifices, and terrible punishments were reserved for those who failed in the requirements of the church of the time, whatever its name. As was the king, so was the god of the people he ruled. As was the king's law, such were the moral and ritual demands of his religion. His god was no less bloodthirsty than he, no less ready to punish with prison and torture, and no less ready to wreak vengeance on his enemies.

In the beginnings of civilization slavery, war, the degradation of women, the torture of enemies, were almost invariable phases of every rule and every government. As was the government, so was the religion. As was the king, such was his god, and that of his subjects. In a word, man made his god in his own image. Since he was cruel, vindictive, revengeful, his god was of like nature. While this was invariably true of human rule in general, and of the religion which reflected it, it might not be true of every ruler or of the whole body of the people under any government. As a rule, however, the king and the government were reflected in the god and his religion.

With the king appears the priest. At first the kingly and the priestly functions are exercised by the same man, for there is no differentiation between the government and the religion. They are not strictly identical, but they closely reflect each other. Government is not exercised in the palace and religion in the temple. The king's house in the early time of the great nations is at once a temple and a palace, the seat of earthly and of heavenly rule. In time there is a division of functions—the priest separates from the king, the government functions in the palace, religion in the temple. The king and the priest each acquires his name and his place, and the offices are divided from each other. This comes about only after civilization has reached some of its higher stages.

This evolutionary process, by means of which religion develops with the growth of civilization, and reflects the stage of cultural advance which has been reached at any given period of human progress, is not one confined to the primitive ages or that of the great ancient empires. It may be seen at every stage of man's evolution in full operation.

In the early days of New England, as an illustration, the sovereignty of God was taught by Jonathan Edwards and his contemporaries as definitely as by any churchman of the past. To these theologians God was a sovereign with absolute power, an autocrat whose rule need have no regard to the wishes of those who were subject to him. This theological opinion did no more than reflect the English conception of the period in regard to the autocratic power of the king. The sovereignty of the English monarch was carried over into the conception of God, and he, too, was a dictator whose will was law, whose wish was accepted as an infallible authority.

From the New England of today the theory of the sovereignty of God has disappeared and has been replaced by the theory of his immanence, that he is lawful, and that he does nothing from whim, caprice, or mere fiat. The sovereignty of the king has disappeared from Republican America, and therefore an autocratic God is no longer acceptable in the democracy of New England. In a word, the conception of God has been democratized. Instead of God being conceived as embodied in one supreme power, concentrated into one personality, he is now accepted as manifested in all persons, in all forms of life and growth, and in the whole of the universe.

This changing conception of God, in conformity with the developing social and political life of man, is bringing about essential modifications of our idea of God at the present time. Since the theory of evolution has been applied to the interpretation of man's history, God has been conceived of also as in a process of growth. The idea of God is not merely one that is in the process of evolution, but God himself is growing as the thought of him is growing. He has not as yet attained his full stature. He is now in a youthful stage of evolution, simply because man is still in the child stage of his progress. At some future period we may hope that he will attain to full maturity, if man so attains. Perhaps he is now hardly more than in his adolescence, if he has progressed so far as that, endowed with a child's cruelties and desire to punish those who do not implicity obey his will. As man becomes more humane, more rational, more truly socialized, we may assume that the conception of God will expand in like manner. Otherwise he can be nothing more than a philosophical abstraction, with no really human qualities in his nature.

As tool processes have evolved from the simplest and rudest stone implement to the most complicated machine of today, so man's social and political advance goes on from stage to stage. Not that tools make the man or that machine processes determine what man is in his intellectual processes, but that the two processes advance not far remote from each other, and that each has its commanding influence on the other. God as a maker and creator could not appear to men until man had himself become a maker in producing his first tools, however crude they might be. God was no other than a great tool-maker until man's productive capacity had advanced far in its evolution. Only as man came to understand nature and its growth processes, and especially as he came to comprehend that man, as well as his culture and his civilization, are growths, and not results of manufacture, could there come to him the thought of God as a life-process within all nature and humanity. We no longer think of him as a sovereign or a captain of souls, but as growth, life, evolution, and that unfolding process which gives us the universe in every phase it manifests.

II.

When we study the idea of God in connection with the evolution of social and political institutions we are led to ask the question, Why is God regarded as a father rather than as a mother? In his essential nature is he masculine rather than feminine? Are we prepared to maintain that in our conception of God there is any quality of sex which justifies his being called a father? In fact, the very idea of sex is repellant to the modern idea of God. It is a mere

conventionality which demands that we shall speak of God with a masculine pronoun. Why we use such a pronoun or name God as a father can be only understood by the history of the idea of God. Once the idea of fatherhood as associated with God had a profound and significant meaning, which it has now entirely lost. Today the fatherhood of God is merely a "survival" in culture. We have quite eliminated from it the idea of sex and of procreation. Such an idea is now repugnant.

There have been periods in the past when there were goddesses as well as gods, and when the real creative power was regarded as feminine rather than as masculine. Only as we take a historic survey of the growth of human opinions is it possible to comprehend the process by which God has been masculinized. Only hints of this process can be given here, however, for it would require a volume to interpret it in its details. Here and there a suggestion may convince us as to the process by which God has come to be identified with the masculine nature. This process is identical with the growth of the worship of ancestors, and the headship of man in the family.

In many parts of the world when man had reached what is called the barbaric stage of social evolution he conceived of the creative power as dual. Heaven he thought of as masculine, the earth as feminine. Out of the earth came trees, plants, grasses, grains, and perhaps all else; therefore it was regarded as a great mother. These two, earth and heaven, by generation, produced all things and creatures known to man, even man himself.

When man was coming into that social stage known as civilization, then war, slavery, and the development of political government placed the king at the head of the state and endowed him with autocratic powers. In the same period the father came to have sovereign power over his family, and he became no other than its king, its autocratic master. The first of these periods gave the idea of heaven as masculine, a father from whom proceeds the world and man. The second gave the idea that from this Father-God alone proceeds all creation, all rule, and all sovereign power in the universe.

A few illustrations will indicate how powerful was this idea of a masculine and supreme deity, a father without a mother by his side, creative with him, as in the olden time. In China two creative principles have been, and are, accepted, known as Yang and Yin. Yang is good, warmth, light, heaven, masculine, man —and is manifested in, or is identical with, each of these forces. On the other hand, Yin is evil, darkness, cold, earth, feminine, woman—this principle expressing itself in each of these forms. Heaven is creative, while earth is receptive. Heaven as masculine is sovereign and is identical with all rule, authority, law, and power. Earth as feminine is submissive and is identical with obedience, inferiority, that which is to be ruled. The sovereign of the state, under the monarchy, was the son of heaven and ruled in the name of Supreme Heaven. From the same source, and by the same authority, the father rules in the family, and was, and is, its autocratic head. In a word, the man rules, both in the state and in the family. The woman obeys, for she is not capable of initiative or authority. The man is superior by virtue of his embodying in himself the spirit of heaven, while the woman is inferior because she represents, and embodies in herself, the spirit and qualities of earth which is subjective to heaven. In China man has always been supreme, so far as history informs us, in the state and in the family, while the woman has been degraded and inferior.

If we turn to India we find the same duality and the same two fundamental principles, here called *purusa,* heaven and masculine; and *prakriti,* earth and feminine. These terms also stand for the universe and mind, if masculine; and the earth, matter, and the primordial principle, if feminine. They are known as Father-Heaven and Mother-Earth. Heaven is over earth, not only physically, but also morally and intellectually. This idea, in one direction at least, works itself out in the conception that, because of his masculinity and his superiority, the father gives origin to the child, and that the mother affords it nothing more than a receptacle, a place in which it may grow. The Code of Manu, that embodiment of Hindu customs and laws, says that the father is the seed, the mother the field in which it is sown. The seed is primary and essential, the field is merely a convenient place in which it may germinate and grow. This means that the life proceeds from the father, the mother merely affording a matrix for it. Therefore, the father, by virtue of his giving origin to the child, has the right to rule over it. Because, also, of this relation to the mother and the child, he is their autocratic king and the master of their earthly destinies.

In Greece we find these same ideas, the same duality of heaven and earth, the same supremacy of the male, and the same origin of the new human life in the father. Aristotle, the supreme thinker of his time and people, in his "Generation of Animals," as well as elsewhere in his writings, says that the mind of the child is from the father, the body from the mother. In this respect Greece made no advance on China and India, but repeated the same fundamental ideas, which had their origin in the same social and political processes. Wherever we go in the ancient world, in every one of the great nations without exception, we find repeated these same ideas, the conception that woman and matter are inferior, that man and mind are supreme. Nor does the evidence indicate that the relations of matter and woman are merely symbolical. It was assumed that woman is of the nature of matter, being not only inferior, but having origin in what is without initiative, incapable of generating life, to be acted upon by that which is superior. This philosophy maintained that mind is dynamic, matter static. This symbolism was carried over to woman, in whom was inherited the qualities of matter, its static condition, its inability to create out of its own qualities. With such reasoning was woman declared to be inferior to man, and incapable of any physical or mental initiative.

If we choose to think that Christianity will advance beyond these old world ideas, as it did in some important directions, we shall find that it has, in this particular, done little more than to borrow from its predecessors. In his "Summary of Theology," and in his other writings, which are now at the basis of all the theological teachings of the Roman Catholic church, Thomas Aquinas has done little more than to repeat Aristotle as to the supremacy of the masculine in the universe and the headship of man in the family. He follows his master in making the father superior in the creation of the child, though he conceives of the mind as having its origin in God.

If Christianity has done much to elevate the position of woman, it has not taken from her the stigma of inferiority, in so far as it has made the man the head of the family, and the mind either directly or indirectly the creation of the father. In this respect it has not freed itself from mythology and the speculative physiology of the antique world. It has remained essentially pagan, autocratic, and unscientific. We have to acknowledge that the ancient world had no true physiological knowledge, and that it did not understand the processes of generation. While our own knowledge of heredity is by no means perfect, we do know that the child inherits equally from the generational succession of the father and the mother. In this respect we have corrected our science; but we have by no means revised the theological implications of the ancient mythology. We enthrone masculinity in heaven, and we assume, as did the ancients, that mind is something quite apart from matter, as if we knew the fundamental nature of either.

If Thomas Aquinas taught the absolute supremacy of God, that all creation is subject to his autocratic will, Martin Luther was not less dogmatic in assuming the dictatorship of the father in the family. The will of the father as head of wife and children was accepted as of unquestionable authority. His wish was law, his whim not to be disputed. The old inferiority and degradation of woman survived as a result, however much they might be modified by Christianity. If woman was regarded as a subject of salvation, if she was accepted as having individual importance in the sight of God, custom and law did not give her personal freedom and the opportunities of a liberal education.

Religion and law alike until quite recently were masculine, autocratic, and too often vindictive. The headship of man in the family, and the autocratic power of the king, gave to religion the sovereignty of God, hard and cruel dogmas, and punishments terrible in their nature. Out of such conditions as these grew the dogma of the Fatherhood of God.

III.

All the primitive religions, with few exceptions, expressed the spirit of fellowship and brotherhood. Within the social group, whatever its particular form of organization, there was community of interest, sharing in common, equality of influence. These social tendencies gave significance to the religion, which was one of faith in democratic gods, who knew no distinctions in the tribal members. The gods had no favorites, knew no high and low, no saints and sinners.

Men were at first united by common needs and common ties of blood. With the growth of autocratic and kingly rule religion came to know its favorites; priests appeared, some persons were regarded as holier than others, while some were thought to be less worthy of the gods. Saints and sinners appeared, and sin came to have a terrible significance. Sacrifices of beasts and men were required, and religion came to have a fearful meaning for those who did not strictly obey its rules.

When we study intimately the causes of this development we find that it corresponded to a change in social and political conditions. The really primitive peoples are said to have been peaceful; but as time went on wars became frequent, slavery appeared, and there was a division into class and castes. There appeared a ruling caste, and this made necessary a class that was servile. Indeed, in some countries several classes appeared, with strict lines of division between them, some superior and some inferior, some born to rule and some born to serve. If there were kings and priests, aristocrats and those accounted nobles, there were also those who were hewers of wood and drawers of water. Some tilled the soil and others served on galleys or in mines. This division of the people into classes was arbitrary, not based on heredity strictly or on mental capacities, but on social conditions.

Coming down to the time of the early great religions from the primitive past we find developed the conception of the blood tie, of fellowship in a common life, of a unity based on common needs, and on sympathy and mutual affection. All the early religions of the higher type were permeated by this feeling of love and devotion. Out of it grew the ethical law of service, formulated into the rule that we should do to others as we would wish them to do to us. All the great civilizations and religions of the ancient world formulated this golden rule, and all of them strove in some measure to give it practical expression in conduct. The golden rule was a survival of what had been in the past rather than what was actually to be found in the present. For the most part it was an ideal rather than a reality under early Christianity.

If it is true, as history seems to indicate, that religion has never been able to rise far above the world in which it exists, then we may trace its characteristics in any epoch to the society by which it is surrounded and represented. When that society is based on slavery it is not difficult for religion to find reasons why subjection of some men to others is approved of God. If slaughter of human beings in war is justified, and as a punishment for crime, it cannot be difficult to accept human sacrifice as meeting with the approval of deity. If a father can take the life of his child, a husband that of his wife, then it naturally follows that God may punish his children in the most vindictive manner. If a king can shut into dark prisons those who offend him, if he can punish them with cruel scourgings and pains unbearable, then the God may properly have his place of torment and of cruelties the most intolerable. In fact, the God who is worshipped can be seldom other than the men who give him their adoration. All the gods reflect what the men are themselves. Cruel men will worship a cruel God; loving men will adore one who is sympathetic and affectionate. A puritanic people will have a God who is strict and exacting, ruling by laws which are rigid and implacable. Even if God is conceived of as loving and forgiving, in practice he will not justify such a belief if those who worship him are vindictive and cruel in their nature and conduct. The higher religions have been taught by the noblest and wisest men, but the majority of those who accept them have by no means reached the high standard thus set before them by the religious founders.

Since in the modern world economic conditions have come to possess a dominating influence, religion too often bows to the power of money. Mammon has too frequently usurped the place of God, and its rule seems frequently to be all-powerful. The church may have the approval of men, but the market controls their acts rather than the teachings of religion and ethics. If piety enters the pulpit, property sits in

the pews. If it is sometimes said that the money-god controls the church, how can it be otherwise when property dominates the halls of legislation and rules from the judge's bench?

We are not to despair of religion, however. While men have before them the example of Socrates in drinking the hemlock cup rather than deny the truth, it cannot fail from the earth. While men know that the Buddha turned from all ease and peace for himself that he might lead his fellows along the path of salvation, religion will forever have a great and sublime meaning. While the Christ dies on the cross that men may know how to prefer good of life and love of their fellows to all merely sensual satisfactions, we may not fear religion will lose its power. In the footsteps of these guides thousands of other men and women have walked, denying mere ease and comfort, in order that they might serve their fellows in some manner worthy of the name of humanity.

We know that in religion imperial power has too often in the past taken the place of love and fellowship. Greed of money has found its place in the church, and it has ruled there as in the market. Because it has ruled elsewhere, therefore, it has found a commanding place in the church. Too often the church has been ruled by greed, caste and social prestige. Hatred, war, cruelty, disregard of human rights, have in the church found apologists and defenders. One of old cast out money changers from the temple; but they have never yet been wholly barred from temple, synagogue or church. Always there is some excuse for their presence, some apology for their acts of greed.

When we consider the teachings of Jesus, we must recognize that he was opposed to war and slavery, that he impressively taught the law of nonresistance, that he desired that men should live together in peace, and that his fundamental principle was that of love and fellowship. During the world war, however, the strange spectacle appeared of the professed followers of Jesus joining in that war as if love and peace formed no part of his teachings. The Prince of Peace, as he has been called, came to be accepted as a god of war, a Mars rather than a forgiving Christ.

—In view of the presence of Mammon in the church, and hatred dominant in the Christian pulpits, it is certain that religion is as yet in great need of reformation and regeneration. There is need of a new Messiah, a fresh teaching of love and good will.

Man has not as yet emerged far from animalism and savagery. The old life yet lingers fundamentally in his instincts and in his desires. He may turn his face toward what is good, even wishing for it with a strong yearning; but the old impulses yet dominate his life. He may believe the creeds of the church, but savagery, hatred and lust are yet too often with him. When greed appeals he answers with alacrity. When war alarms sound he marches with eagerness. When lust attracts, the charm of that seduction cannot be resisted.

Even if this be true, we have no right to despair. Man's evolution has been slow, his progress has been painful and difficult. The growth he has made in the past assures us that he will go onward in the future, with many a retreat and surrender, it may be, but with assured progress toward what is true and just. Too often the old savage instincts survive and find expression; but they are being held under control more and more effectively. Though hatred and war seem to be more terrible now than ever before, the arts of peace have become more effective, more nearly universal, more dominant in the life of mankind. Peoples know each other better, there is more of communication between them, and the ways of fellowship between men were never so predominant as they are now. War is more hateful than at any time in the past, and the promises of fraternity were never so bright as at this moment. The desire for peace is more nearly universal than any other period has presented to the world.

In considering the future evolution of religion we need to keep in mind that it is profoundly influenced by the social and political changes which go on in the life of mankind. In the past nations and civilizations were largely isolated from each other. As a consequence, religions were provincial, peculiar, each with its own creed and ritual. What we see taking place now is the development of the close relations of nations to each other. New methods of transportation and communication are bringing the peoples of the world into new relations of mutual dependence. There is rapidly developing a world unity, even though war and hatred may seem to be rampant everywhere.

Religion must follow this trend of modern civilization. The world unity of civilization must lead to some kind of world federation, and that to a greater sympathy of the several religions for each other. It may never come about that there will be in the world only one ritual and one creed, but it will doubtless come to be recognized more and more that at their basis all religions have a common purpose and ideal.

We may be assured that as civilization advances, and woman comes to take a place of equality beside man in every phase of their common life, that the assumption that God is masculine will pass away. If he is to represent and respond to every phase of human existence it must be recognized that deity is as much feminine as masculine, that fatherhood belongs no more to God than motherhood. All phases of sex expression must be withdrawn from the conception of God or else some word must be coined which will express both feminine and masculine attributes. We have gone far in the modern thought of God to eliminate all sex ideas, though the sex names are retained. When we speak of God as a father it has come about that the motherly qualities are involved more often than those which are fatherly. The fact is that a new conception of God is growing with the advance of woman to a position of social, political and intellectual equality with man.

As mankind advances in democracy, equality, moral purpose and social fellowship, religion is coming more fully to accept and to express in daily life the spirit of the great religious teachers of the world. This process may seem to advance very slowly, yet the fact is that a new light is coming into the minds of men, a growing desire for co-operation, community of interests, and fellowship in thought and deed. If the hindrances to this advance are many the demands for it are strengthening with every century. Religious hatred is less strong than formerly, persecution has nearly ceased, and each religion looks in a more kindly way on all the others. At the present time one fellowship of all mankind does not seem to be an impossi-

bility, nor one permanent congress of all the faiths of the world. As the socialization of human forces and interests proceeds such unity of the faiths of men may be realized.

We are greatly in need of a broadening of the spirit and purposes of the church as an institution. There should be less of dogma and more of genuine fellowship, more of helpfulness and service, more of freedom to the mind, and more of loyalty of man to man. What we most have need of is that man himself shall become the supreme ideal of religion, that his life may be made more humane, just, and wise. To make the world a fit place for men to live in should be the great purpose of religion.

In a word, the workers, producers, inventors, and thinkers should be in the future the guides of mankind. This means that religion shall dwell less in the clouds and find its place in the homes of men, to give strength, hope, and courage to all who labor in whatever kind. The faith that makes faithful is that which the world now demands, and that faith is coming slowly but surely to find its place in all the religions of men, to bring them all into a closer comradeship of love and service.

CONTRIBUTED

Straight Thinking on the Question of War

I.—Do Big Armies and Navies Prevent War?

We have heard it said so many times that: "The best way to secure peace is to be prepared for war," that the statement is often accepted as the truth. *Let us think.* To be prepared for war means armies, navies, professional soldiers, poison gas, powder, all the equipments to fight at any moment. These forces of militarism are in the hands, not of the people, but of the power that runs the governments; these powers are the bankers and industrial magnates. Every nation today is competing with every other nation for trade, commercial advantage. Give them the equipment ready at hand for war, and the commercial magnates of any nation will, if necessary, appeal to arms to thwart the commercial supremacy of any other nation. The history of Germany and England has been for twenty years a history of shrewd maneuvering for commercial advantage. If Germany had not had a big military establishment, and England a big naval establishment, the maneuvering would have gone on indefintely, and the most successful commercial nation would have won. As it was, when German commercialism became pressed too hard, the Junkers used the military-loving government to order war to thwart her commercial rival; and England, believing herself secure in her own military and naval forces, was ready, not to try to secure peace, but to meet them halfway. Any nation with a big armament establishment is a menace to itself and the world. The commercial class which dominates every government in the world will if hard pressed, appeal to arms if they are at hand. *The only safety against war is for the people to refuse to allow big armies and navies.*

II.—Does the Christian Religion Tolerate War?

When wars are declared, the modern churches and clergy, being to an extent attached to the state, become the strongest of nationalists, and urge the prosecution of war, and defend it as an institution. Is there any warrant in the Christian religion for this attitude, or are the clergy and the churches perverting the *faith.*

In answer it may be said, that the church and the clergy of the first 250 years following Jesus, and who may be supposed to be good interpreters of his teachings, as they had access to documents and traditions lost to us, taught that war had no place in the life of a Christian. But beyond that, what documents have come down to us, teach conclusively that the precept and example of Jesus was against war. Jesus avoided physical clash (John 8:59 and 10:39); he told his disciples to flee rather than fight (Matt. 10:23); he refused to fight (Matt. 18:36); he warned his people that they who took the sword should perish by it (Matt. 26:52 and John 18:11); Jesus refused to resist Annas when arrested (Luke 22:51 and Matt. 26;52); Palestine had as much justice for an armed revolt as any people ever had in history, such methods were advocated, yet Jesus resisted such advice, he combatted the idea of a Messiah who should lead armies to victory, and taught that the Messiah should be the "Suffering Servant" pictured by Isaiah. The Sermon on the Mount teaches non-resistance, and the highest of the Beatitudes is the blessing that comes to *peace-makers.* The Christian religion as taught by Jesus in his doctrine and example, as understood by his followers who stood near to him, *is an anti-war religion.*

III.—Is War a Crime Against the Human Race?

The laws of every nation on the globe make it a crime, reprehensible in the sight of opinion and punishable by severe penalties, for any two persons, or any groups of persons, to attempt to settle disputes by combat with dangerous weapons. If we enlarge the groups to include a whole nation, do we in any way change the ethical status of the act? If physical combat between Jones and Brown is a crime, if the feud between the Hatfield and McCoy clans is a crime, is it any less of a crime for a larger clan, though each be on the different sides of a state border, to settle their disputes by an appeal to arms, and by murder and pillage?

IV.—If War Be Crime, Who Are the Criminals?

There have been wars without any criminals. Such a war was our own war between the states; such was our war for independence. In each instance stupidity and ignorance misled the people till the situation became so heated that a clash was the natural result; and in each clash a Merciful Providence saw to it that the right won out. In the World War the situation became so involved, the masses so insane, that like fire it spread, nations were involved, and out of it came an end which is best for all. But the men who in parliament and assembly hall sit down and vote war, and the munitions of war, and send the boys by millions to death, these are the criminals. When one boy is killed in a boxing match, the churches rise in indignation and cry for legislation to stop it, and for a penalty to be put upon the instigators of the boxing match. When ten million boys are killed in battle, the churches bless the movement and erect monuments within the sacred edifices for the civic leaders who voted the wars.

V.—What is the Practical Thing for the People to do to Stop War?

There are two practical steps that the people may take to stop war, and for which we should all labor:

First, work for disarmament. Refuse to re-elect the men who vote appropriations for armaments. Put up and support candidates pledged to vote against appropriating money for guns and powder and professional soldiers.

Second, work for, put up and vote for candidates, pledged to so change the organic law of states and nations, that no war can be declared by anyone save the people themselves on a referendum vote. The power to order us into war is too dangerous to give to any group of men, whether they be called kings, premiers, parliaments, presidents or congressmen.

ROLAND D. SAWYER.

SELECTED

Concerning Some Beliefs on the Origin of the War*

(*Report to the Congress of the Federation of the Seine of the League for the Rights of Man. July 27, 1920.*)

The Treaty of Versailles held the conquered alone responsible for the war. There is not one sufficient reason for accepting this judgment as true. On the contrary, there are the very strongest reasons for questioning it, if one examines the chief arguments by which this belief in the responsibility of one party alone was supported during the war and on which it still leans today.

It is said that the Central Empires alone had prepared for war.

During the ten years which preceded it, Russia, France and England had written into their budgets forty-six thousand million (francs) for military expenses while the Central Empires had written into theirs only twenty-three for the same purpose.

It is said that the policy of the governments of the Entente was pacific.

In 1915 the Germans seized at Brussels and published 119 reports addressed, from 1905 to 1914, to the Belgian government by its ministers in London, Paris and Berlin.

Note how one publication, otherwise very favorable to France, *la Revue de Lausanne*, summed up these reports when they appeared: "The Belgian diplomats devoted themselves to showing that the foreign policy of France, and still more that of England, is a danger to the peace of Europe."

In February, 1919, the Russian Soviet Government published in *The Pravda* the correspondence exchanged from 1908 to 1914 between the Russian ambassadors at London and at Paris with their government. Prof. Pokroksky, commissary of the people in charge of this publication, said, "All these documents show clearly the activities of the Entente in regard to the preparation for war."

It is said that Serbia was innocent.

This was not the opinion of the English at the beginning of the war. Note what could be read in newspapers of most sharply contrasted shades of opinions.

"If Serbia could be towed to the middle of the ocean and sunk there, the atmosphere of Europe would be cleared."—*Manchester Guardian, August* 3.

"Serbia ought to disappear. Let us wipe her off the map of Europe."—*John Bull, August* 8.

The British Minister of Foreign Affairs himself said on July 27th to the Austrian ambassador: "If it is possible for Austria to make war on Serbia and at the same time give satisfaction to Russia, it would be well and good."—*I. diplom. Eng. No.* 48.

It is said that the Serbian government could not have accepted the Austrian note without dishonor.

Nevertheless, the Italian government suggested to the English government, July 27th, that it advise Serbia to accept it. (1. Eng. No. 57.) The following day, the 28th, it made a new attempt in the same direction. The Serbian envoy had told it (the Italian government) that his government would be ready to accept the note in full if explanations were supplied of Articles V and VI. Precisely the explanations given in this respect by Austria in its memorandum to the Powers on July 27th seemed to him of a nature to facilitate Serbia's acceptance. (1. Eng. No. 64.)

It is to be noted that this memorandum has not been published in the diplomatic records of the Entente.

It is said that in refusing arbitration the Central Empires put themselves under the ban of humanity.

Would a Russian, French or English government have accepted it any more readily? Why should not Austria have used force against Serbia in 1914 since Serbia had used it in 1912 against Turkey and in 1913 against Bulgaria? Where and when have its adversaries insisted upon making it accept arbitration. The offer is made in an inconspicuous way at the end of the reply of Serbia and incidentally in a personal telegram from the Czar to the Kaiser which the Russian government kept secret for six months. One mention, that is all. Nobody has ever heard it spoken of again. The governments of the Entente have never made a statement concerning it in the course of their negotiations. Why did they not solemnly declare that they were determined henceforth if Austria accepted arbitration never to make war themselves on any nation small or great? Then or never was the moment to practice what they preached.

It is said that the Emperor William, the modern Attila, had personally plotted this war in order to gorge his people with plunder.

On the 28th of July the Emperor received a copy of the Serbian reply to the Austrian note. He wrote these words about it: "To have obtained these results in forty-eight hours is superb. It is more than could have been expected. It is a great moral victory for Vienna. But now every reason for war disappears and the Austrian minister could well have remained at Belgrade. In such conditions I myself would never have ordered mobilization against Serbia." (Doc. Kautsky, No. 27.) And he wrote immediately to the Minister of Foreign Affairs to present to him a draft of consonant instructions for his ambassador at Vienna. (No. 293.)

It is said that the German government never wished to counsel Austria to moderation.

On the 25th of July, precisely in fulfillment of this desire of the Kaiser, the German government telegraphed to Vienna, "The Serbian reply contains such concessions to the Austrian demands that if the Austrian government maintains an uncompromising attitude, it must expect to see the public opinion of all Europe turn increasingly away from it." (Doc. Kautsky, No. 323.) From that moment it urged Austria to have an explanation with Russia and to accept the mediation of England. Further, in order that its efforts might not be denied, it had recourse to an

*Translated especially for UNITY.

unusual proceeding. It caused to be published in an English journal, *The Westminster Gazette* of August 1st, the text of one of the most comminatory of its dispatches to Vienna.

It is said that the general mobilization was a simple measure of precaution devoid of warlike intentions and that in calling upon Russia to discontinue, Germany had merely chosen a pretext for declaring war against her.

Under No. 71 of the Yellow Book of the Franco-Russian Alliance is repeated a conversation which took place August 18, 1892, between General de Boisdeffre, the French negotiator, and the Czar on the subject of Article III of the Military Convention by which the two powers pledged themselves to mobilize immediately if Germany or Austria mobilized against one of them. "I remarked to the Emperor that mobilization was the declaration of war," says the General. "It is precisely so that I understand it," replies the Emperor. Why should Germany have understood it otherwise?

It is said that the general Russian mobilization was an answer to the general mobilization of Austria.

On September 15, 1917, the Russian government, then represented by Kerensky, admitted in an official statement that the order for general mobilization was issued in Russia the evening of July 30, 1912, and no one dates the order for general mobilization in Austria earlier than July 31. But even before the Kerensky statement, the truth was known.

It is said that France and England did not wish war.

Between the time when the order was published for the general Russian mobilization (night of the 30th to 31st) and the declaration of war by Germany against Russia (August 1 at 7 in the evening) plenty of time had elapsed for their governments to have demanded of Russia that she cease to mobilize, as mobilization was practically war.

It is said in fact that France entered the war solely for the purpose of resisting the aggression of Germany; without that aggression, there would not have been war.

During his great address on the afternoon of August 3rd, the English Minister of Foreign Affairs, Sir Edw. Grey, announced to the Commons, "I can assert it with most absolute certainty. The French are involved in the war because of an obligation of honor resulting from an alliance with Russia." Germany did not declare war against France until the *evening* of the day when these words were spoken. Thus the declaration of war by Germany was after the entrance of France into the war; it was the result, not the cause.

It is said that Germany's aggression against France was the greatest crime that was ever committed by a civilized government against the rights of humanity.

In *The Manual of the Law of Nations,* by Foignet, one reads, "According to the agreement of the ally of one or the other of the belligerents, one of two things can occur. Either the ally will attack the belligerent in pursuance of his treaty of alliance, or the ally will remain undecided, awaiting the results of the first engagements; in this case the belligerent, if he knows of the existence of the treaty of alliance, and if he considers himself strong enough, can attack his enemy's ally, after a preliminary declaration of war." (p. 490.) *The Manual* being nothing but the summary of the *quod plerumque docetur,* this theory should be accepted as logical. In attacking France, Germany did not therefore commit any crime, she followed the rules of the game.

It is said that this attack surprised France, was made in a treacherous manner.

This attack was not a surprise for anyone. It was published everywhere that in case of war simultaneously against France and Russia, it would be a necessity of life or death for Germany to try and attack one of her adversaries as soon as possible in order to turn afterwards against the other with all her forces, and that the adversary she would attack first would be France. The French government was so little surprised by Germany's attack, that she exposed herself to it deliberately. July 29th and 30th, then almost a week before the declaration of war, the French ambassador said to the Foreign Office "that France expected that Germany would demand of her, either the cessation of her preparations, or a declaration of neutrality, and as France could not yield to either one or the other of these demands, that she (Germany) would attack her."

It is said that by keeping her troops ten kilometers distant from the frontier, the French government gave the most positive proof that she did not desire war, and made the supreme sacrifice for the cause of peace.

But since the general Russian mobilization was equivalent to a declaration of war, and since France was pledged by honor to aid Russia, this withholding of the troops was only a bluff; it was moreover no sacrifice, since by the admission of even M. Viviani in his speech of January 31, 1919, the staff, after being consulted, had not raised any objections. It did not change anything in the course of events and could not make any difference. It did not prevent Sir Edward Grey from stating, on the 3rd of August, that France was involved in the war by her alliance.

It is said that England entered the war only in order to force the neutrality of Belgium to be respected.

It is true that in his great speech of August 6, Mr. Asquith, after propounding the question, Why is England fighting? solemnly proclaimed that it was for that reason and no other. And he made it explicit by adding, "We do not fight for selfish reasons." But the famous leader of *The Times* on the 8th of the following March was entirely devoted to showing that England would certainly have joined France and Russia even if Germany had respected Belgian neutrality, that she did not intend to play at being an international Don Quixote, and that if she had entered the war it was because her interests were at stake, interests which consisted in overthrowing Germany as she had overthrown Philip II, Louis XIV and Napoleon I.

Here, then, apart from all the reasons of conscience and common sense, is a brief sketch of the documentary reasons because of which one must decline to place the whole responsibility of the war on Germany. It seems that this corner of the veil lifted, the League ought to endeavor to tear it entirely away. It was formed a quarter of a century ago to secure revision of a verdict rendered contrary to the essential forms of justice. It ought to demand today the revision of Article 231 of the Treaty of Versailles, by which the adversaries of Germany have condemned her without discussion, in spite of her protestations and under penalty of seeing hostilities renewed within five days, to acknowledge herself as alone responsible for the war. As it is on this acknowledgment that the whole treaty has been made to rest, and especially the matter of reparations, the question is of importance.

Paris, France. G. DEMARTIAL.

THE FIELD.

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

A DECLARATION MADE AT PEACE CONFERENCE IN HOLLAND.

The following statement, prepared at a recent conference in Bilthoven, Holland, by the Association known as "Paco," the Esperanto word for peace, is of great interest.—Editors.

War is a crime against humanity. It is a crime against life, and uses human personalities for political and economic ends. We, therefore, actuated by an intense love for mankind, are determined not to support, either directly by service of any kind in the army, navy or air forces, or indirectly by making or consciously handling munitions or other war material, subscribing to war loans, performing any service provided by a government as an alternative to military service, or using our labor for the purpose of setting others free for war service, any kind of war, aggressive or defensive, remembering that modern wars are invariably alleged by governments to be defensive.

Wars would seem to fall under three heads:

(a) Wars to defend the state to which we nominally belong and wherein our home is situated. To refuse to take up arms for this end is difficult: 1. Because the state will use all its coercive powers to make us do so. 2. Because our inborn love for home has been deliberately identified with love of the state in which it is situated.

(b) Wars to preserve the existing order of society with its security for the privileged few. That we would never take up arms for this purpose goes without saying.

(c) Wars on behalf of the oppressed proletariat, whether for its liberation or defense. To refuse to take up arms for this purpose is most difficult: 1. Because the proletarian regime, and even more, the enraged masses, in time of revolution would regard as a traitor anyone who refused to support the new order by force. 2. Because our instinctive love for the suffering and the oppressed would tempt us to use violence on their behalf.

Moreover, we are convinced that violence cannot really preserve order, defend our homes, liberate the proletariat. In fact, experience has shown that in all wars, order, security and liberty disappear, and that, so far from benefiting by them, the proletariat always suffers most. We hold, however, that consistent pacifists have no right to take up a merely negative position, but must recognize and strive for the removal of all the causes of war.

We recognize as causes of war, not only the instinct of egotism and greed, which is found in every human heart, but also all agencies which create hatred and antagonism between groups of people. Among such, we would regard the following as the more important today:

1. Differences between races, leading by artificial aggravation to envy and hatred.
2. Differences between religions, leading to mutual intolerance and contempt.
3. Differences between the classes, the possessing and the non-possessing, leading to civil war, which will continue so long as the present system of production exists, and private profit rather than social need is the outsanding motive of society.
4. Differences between nations, due largely to the present system of production, leading to world wars and such economic chaos as we see today, which eventualities, we are convinced, could be prevented by the adoption of a system of world economy which had for its end the wellbeing of the entire human race.
5. Finally, we see an important cause of war in the prevalent misconception of the state. The state exists for man, not man for the state. The recognition of the sanctity of human personality must become the basic principle of human society. Furthermore, the state is not a sovereign self-contained entity, as every nation is a part of the great family of mankind. We feel, therefore, that consistent pacifists have no right to take up a merely negative position, but must devote themselves to abolishing classes, barries between the peoples, and to creating a world-wide brotherhood founded on mutual service.

THE COMMUNITY CHURCH.

The idea of the community church is rapidly spreading. A notable instance comes from the Far West and was obtained from an abstract of a sermon sent to the writer by the Rev. W. H. Hopkins, pastor of the Manitou (Col.) Community Church. His subject was "The Community Church Vision." The text was taken from Acts xxvi:19: "I was not disobedient to the heavenly vision." One paragraph of the sermon voices the thought of the whole discourse. It is as follows:

"The vision is of God. The burden of Christ's prayer on the last day of His earthly life was 'that they may all be one.' Some time, somewhere, that prayer is going to be answered. Church members may forget and selfishly refuse to obey, nevertheless the prayer will be answered. It is His desire that Christians draw together in order that the world may believe. Whenever you get any group of Christians on their knees or united in a real effort for His kingdom they are one. The vision is of God and the great longing heart of the Christian world is for it. This summer Christians of every name and creed have met here. They have come from the North and from the South, and almost without exception they have been captivated with the Community Church idea. Whatever may be true of the denominational leaders, the people want the Community Church. Many of our friends have come through in autos. As they have crossed Kansas or Oklahoma they have been impressed with two types of buildings seen in almost every town. In each community they have noted the fine high school building of tapestry brick, well cared for and presenting all the earmarks of community pride. Then in each place they have noted the two or three or half a dozen little churches, each presenting a forlorn appearance. What stronger appeal could there be for strong community churches appealing to the community pride? All week the young people of the town go to the one high school. Why on Sunday do they need to go to a half dozen weak and enthusiasmless Sunday schools?"—*The Brooklyn Eagle.*

PACIFIST PLAYS

John Haynes Holmes says of the volume, *A Cry Out of the Dark, by Henry Bailey Stevens:* "These three little plays teach their lesson more impressively than reams of argument."

¶ "Uncommonly arresting," declares the Brooklyn *Eagle.* No hater of war can afford to miss these gripping dramas.

Bound in boards, **60 Cents**, postpaid.

H. B. STEVENS : Durham, N. H.

DISARMAMENT AND THE U. S. SENATE.

The *Chugai Shogyo,* a Tokyo daily, stated in one of its recent editorials as follows:

"If a sincere proposal for co-operation is made by Great Britain and America regarding the reduction of naval armament, Japan will enthusiastically welcome it. But it is regrettable to note that there is inconsistency in the American plea for naval reduction as expressed in the action of the Senate. The Senate voted unanimously for the Borah resolution, but at the same time it increased the naval appropriations passed by the House of Representatives. Japan for one is at

DUTY TO CIVILIZATION

A Pamphlet answering many questions as to the causes of the Great War, written by FRANCIS NEILSON, author of "How Diplomats Make War," etc., Editor of THE FREEMAN and Associate Editor of UNITY.

This pamphlet will appeal to all those who believe the true history of the war and its causes is yet to be written, and that it is essential to the best development of our civilization.

Published by the

UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY

Price, 30 Cents 700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICAGO

Reprinted from UNITY

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244

WRIGHT & COMPANY

STEAM—DOMESTIC

COAL

TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

Schumann & Company

Cleaners of

FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

PHONE DREXEL 231
ALL DEPARTMENTS

MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.

PRINTERS and BINDERS

Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

Bowman Dairy Company

MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY

Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk

DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?

4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices

EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

Subscribe for and read UNITY—
Do not miss a single number!

a loss to understand the true intention of the United States.

"The idea of disaramament is no new thing, and it has taken a concrete shape in the League of Nations. America's failure to join the League owing to domestic circumstances was unfortunate but inevitable. It formed the stumbling block for the movement for disarmament. America, to say the least, therefore, is responsible for the existing state of military competition. She is morally bound to make up in some other way what she destroyed by failure to join the League. It is her turn now to sincerely propose—nay, take concrete steps for—disarmament."

[Sent by Lucia Ames Mead from *East and West News Bulletin.*]

THE ETERNAL RIDDLE.

Israel, my people,
God's greatest riddle,
Will thy solution
Ever be told?

Fought—never conquered,
Bent—never broken,
Mortal—immortal,
Youthful, though old.

Egypt enslaved thee
Babylon crushed thee,
Rome led thee captive,
Homeless thy head.

Where are those nations
Mighty and fearsome?
Thou has survived them,
They are long dead.

Nations keep coming,
Nations keep going,
Passing like shadows,
Wiped off the earth.

Thou an eternal
Witness remainest,
Watching their burial,
Watching their birth.

Pray, who revealed thee
Heaven's great secret;
Death and destruction
Thus to defy?

Suffering torture,
Stake, inquisition—
Prithee, who taught thee
Never to die?

Ay, and who gave thee
Faith, deep as ocean
Strong as the rock-hills,
Fierce as the sun?

Hated and hunted,
Ever thou wand'rest,
Bearing a message:
God is but one!

Pray, has thy saga
Likewise an ending,
As its beginning
Glorious of old?

Israel, my people,
God's greatest riddle,
Will thy solution
Ever be told?

P. M. Raskin.

The Talmud Magazine.

THOMAS STARR KING

PATRIOT AND PREACHER

By CHARLES W. WENDTE

The "Life and Letters" of this distinguished Unitarian hero who gave his life for the Union cause. Written by one who was personally acquainted with Starr King, and who was stirred by the eloquence of this great orator.

The State Legislature of California has recently voted to place a marble statue of Starr King in the National Hall of Fame in Washington as one of the two representative heroes of Californian History.

5 Illustrations. 8vo. 344 pages. $3.00 net. $3.25 by mail.

At All Booksellers, or from

THE BEACON PRESS 25 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.

BOOKSHOP LOCATED AT 16 BEACON STREET